

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/534,798	10/13/2005	Tokuo Tsuura	0445-0352PUS1	8677	
22/2	7590 03/05/2001 ARTKOLASCH & BII	EXAMINER			
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			CORDRAY, DENNIS R		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1731		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/05/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/534,798	TSUURA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Dennis Cordray	1731		

	Dennis Cordray	1/31	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final reject E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ion. FILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	hs of the date of ne appeal. Since
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally rej	TE below);	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-11. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		il be entered and an	explanation of
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence	ot be entered is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ils to provide a (1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. 	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
			·

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 10/534,798

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended claims present new issues that require further searching and/or consideration in that1) the spiral windings of the tube overlap, and 2) the content of inorganic fiber in the composition is changed.

The substitute specification filed 2/13/2007 has not been entered because it does not conform to 37 CFR 1.125(b) and (c) because the statement as to a lack of new matter under 37 CFR 1.125(b) is missing.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant has argued that the references cannot be combined because they are from non-analogous art. The references teach paper products that withstand high heat applications, thus are analogous art and/or solve the same problem of obtaining resistance to high heat. Applicant has argued that the products of some of the references cannot withstand temperatures of 1400 degrees or the shrinking properties of the claimed invention. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181,26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)..

The claims recite a structure, which is revealed in the cited prior art. There is no recitation in the claims of the temperature or shrinkage properties required of the structure. The rejections are maintained.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700